

## **APPENDIX A. ISSUES, QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS**

At each of the public meetings, representatives from the Division of Entomology and Plant Pathology presented the proposed gypsy moth project, and answered and received questions and comments. The presentation explained:

- the life cycle, feeding habits and hosts of gypsy moth,
- the identification of gypsy moth,
- survey methods,
- gypsy moth impacts and damage to the trees and forest,
- selection of proposed sites,
- selection of the treatment options,
- the timing and application of treatments,
- boundaries of the treatment sites with maps and photos.

Following the presentation and during the presentation, questions and comments were taken, answered and discussed with the people attending the meetings. Representatives of the Division of Forestry and Purdue University also attended the meetings and assisted in answering and discussing questions and comments from the people attending the meetings.

The questions and comments received at the public meetings concerned four issues;

- Human health and safety;
- Nontarget effects and environmental effects;
- Economic and political impacts;
- Likelihood of success of the proposed project and the treatment options proposed.

The public meetings did not develop any additional issues. Other questions received at the public meetings asked about gypsy moth biology, gypsy moth impacts, and what the public can do to address gypsy moth on their property.

### **ISSUES**

#### **Human health and safety**

The questions and comments received at the public meeting regarding human health and safety were in three areas:

- The use and risk of Btk;
- The use and risk of pheromone flakes in mating disruption; and
- The notification process for the implementation of the project.

Btk questions concerned the risk to humans, how long it has been used, and how long it persists in the environment. One lady, concerned about her and her children's health regarding Btk, commented that she consulted her doctor who contacted a doctor in the east familiar with Btk. The lady's doctor received a report from the doctor that he consulted that Btk was safe. The lady was informed of this response and she feels safe.

with the use of Btk. The responses explained minor eye or nasal irritation may occur in a few people and that treatments are halted when children or school buses are present.

Mating disruption questions concerned risk to humans and how long it persists in the environment. The responses explained how the pheromone flakes worked and that there is no risk from the pheromone or glue used with the flakes.

Notification questions concerned how the people in the sites would be notified when the decision to do, or not do, the project would be made and how they would be notified of actual treatment if the project were conducted. The responses explained how the sites were selected, when the decision to do, or not do, the project would be made, and how people would be notified when the treatment is applied.

### **Nontarget and environmental effects**

For the use of Btk, nontarget questions inquired about Btk effects on birds, pets, other butterflies (including Karner blue butterfly) and other animals. The questions on environmental effects of Btk asked about the fate of Btk in the soil and how long Btk persists.

For the risk to nontargets, the responses explained that Btk would have an affect on other caterpillars of butterfly and moths but not on other nontarget organisms. Regarding Karner blue butterfly questions at one meeting, the response explained that Karner blue butterfly is not present in the proposed site and thus Btk is not a concern. At a second meeting, the response explained that the boundaries of the proposed Btk treatment site were defined to prevent treatment over possible Karner blue butterfly habitat.

For the Btk risk to the environment, the response explained that applications of Btk formulations do not increase levels of Btk in soil and that it persists for a relatively short time in the environment.

For the use of pheromone flakes, questions inquired about nontarget effects on fish and other butterflies. The questions on environmental effects asked how long the pheromone lasts and how long the flake persists in the environment.

For the risk to nontargets from pheromone flakes, the response explained that the pheromone would not affect fish and other animals, and that it is specific to gypsy moth and would not affect other butterflies, such as Karner blue butterfly, and moths.

The response to environmental risk explained that the flake emits pheromone for 12-16 weeks and the flake may take 10-15 years to biodegrade.

During the response to nontarget and environmental questions, the response explained that direct application of Btk and pheromone flakes to water is avoided.

## **Economic and political impacts**

People asked the gypsy moth quarantine, funding of the treatment and potential damage to cars and homes. The response explained how the quarantine works, and that the state and federal government pay for the treatments. For potential damage to homes, the response explained the impact of gypsy moth defoliation and damage to trees and the potential damage to property values. For potential damage to cars, the response explained that Btk and the flakes deposited on cars can be washed off or the cars can be placed in a garage during treatment.

During the public meeting for the South Bend sites, the discussion and comment of the people attending the meeting lead to a vote in support of the project. The vote was 100% of the residents at the meeting in favor of the project.

## **Likelihood of success**

The questions received regarding this issue were prior treatment successes and how effective is pheromone flakes and Btk.

The response to effectiveness explained that success is directly linked to what we know about the gypsy moth population in terms of density, area it occupies, and host availability. To be effective the treatment has to be carefully selected and applied properly and at the right time. Examples of past use of pheromone flakes and Btk were given to explain effectiveness.

Three questions concerned prior treatments near or in the proposed project sites. The response explained these projects and their success.

## **OTHER QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS**

People asked how treatment sites were selected, how decisions were made, what people can do if they have gypsy moth, can they buy traps to use, who comes to check out their trees, and can their property be treated.

For the selections of treatment sites, the response explained that treatment sites are selected through analysis of survey data from detection and delimit traps using the protocol of the Slow-The-Spread Program. IDNR and USFS staff reviews this analysis to confirm the need for treatment, conducts ground surveys for other gypsy moth life stages in the proposed sites, and conducts aerial surveys to refine the treatment boundaries.

For the decision process, the response explained that public meetings are used to seek landowner comments, issues and concerns, to explain the time frame for the decision process and that the decision would be made by the State Entomologist.

The response to what they can do explained that people can call the DNR to let us know if they have gypsy moth, they can destroy eggmasses, or they could use barriers to prevent caterpillars from moving up the tree.

The response for buying traps explained that this is discouraged because the data from their trap would not be available to the DNR to use in the analysis of the trapping survey.

The response for checking trees for gypsy moth explained that the DNR would send an employee to examine trees suspected of having gypsy moth.

For the request to be treated, the response explained that under the present management for gypsy moth, requests for treatment outside the proposed sites are not accepted. In the future, requests will be accepted when a suppression program to manage gypsy moth is implemented